



**HISTORIC PRESERVATION
COMMISSION**

Mike Deskin
Elias Esquer
Bob Gasser, Chair
Dan Killoren
Ann Patterson
Stuart Siefer, RA
Liz Wilson, Vice-Chair

♦ ♦ ♦

**HISTORIC PRESERVATION
OFFICER**

Joe Nucci, RA



The City of Tempe is a
Certified Local Government,
in association with the United
States Department of the
Interior/National Park Service



Tempe Historic
Preservation Office
Community Development
Department
21 East 6th Street, Suite 208
P.O. Box 5002
Tempe, AZ 85280

♦ ♦ ♦

480.350.8028
8579 FAX; 8913TDD



Tempe Historic Preservation Commission (Tempe HPC)

MEETING MINUTES

Meeting Date: Thursday, July 13, 2006

Location: Hatton Hall
34 East Seventh Street

Commissioners Present: Mike Deskin
Esquer, Elias
Bob Gasser
Ann Patterson
Siefer, Stuart
Wilson, Elizabeth

Staff Present: Amy Douglass, Museum Administrator
Joe Nucci, CDD Historic Preservation Officer
Mark Vinson, CDD City Architect

Public Present: Julia Andrews 85281
Jim Garrison SHPO
Karyn Gitlis 85281
Bob Gray 85281
Chris Higgins 85282
Vic Linoff THMAB
Pamela Rector 85283
Virginia Sandstedt 85281
Betsy Tait 85281
Eduarda Yates 85282

Call to Order: 6:00 pm, Bob Gasser, Chair

I. Call to Audience

Chairman Gasser acknowledged public attendance and made a call to the audience. Eduarda Yates expressed concern that ASU has discontinued flood irrigation at the Harrington/Birchett House located at 202 East 7th Street.

II. Approval of Minutes

Chairman Gasser called for discussion of the minutes of the Tempe HPC meeting of June 8, 2006, and requested a change to the motion for the Roosevelt Addition Historic District to add the word "ENTIRE" before the phrase "ROOSEVELT ADDITION HISTORIC DISTRICT".

MOTION MADE BY COMMISSIONER PATTERSON AND SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER DESKIN TO APPROVE MINUTES OF THE JUNE 8, 2006, TEMPE HPC MEETING AS AMENDED. MOTION CARRIED 6-0.

III. Discuss & Consider – Historic District Boundary Alternatives

Chairman Gasser opened discussion to review boundary alternatives for College View 1946~1953, Gage Addition 1909~1954, and Park Tract 1930~1960 in consideration of nominations received from property owners for historic district designation. He noted that the nominations submitted for review propose two districts; configured as Gage Addition, and College View with Park Tract.

At this point Commissioner Deskin and HPO Nucci recused themselves from the deliberations and took places in the audience. City Architect Mark Vinson then took over as HPO for the duration of the discussion.

Chairman Gasser stated that based on the commission approved study Post World War II Subdivisions Tempe, Arizona: 1945 – 1960 (Solliday 2001) the commission has recognized each of these three subdivisions to be eligible historic districts.

Gasser circulated maps he prepared previously indicating "relatively new" properties in yellow for consideration by the commission. He noted the presence of the 1999 Ash Court subdivision re-plat (MCR 464-38) and the Sienna Court 2005 subdivision re-plat (MCR 663-06) within the Gage Addition. He stated his recommendation is to define boundaries to exclude perimeter development from after the period of significance. Commissioner Wilson asked if the boundaries proposed by Gasser included some commercial properties. Gasser indicated his proposal is to exclude modern development when it occurs at the perimeter of the district.ⁱ

Commissioner Siefer asked if there was precedence for excluding non-contributing properties at the edges of the district or if there were advantages to doing so. Wilson cautioned that HPC will not have review authority for properties that are not included within the district, even though they could have potential to effect district character by virtue of their proximity.

Vinson asked for clarification of the status of the National Register eligible and listed properties in the 900 block of Mill Ave. Gasser indicated these are proposed to be included within the boundaries.

SHPO Garrison stated it is the general policy of the Keeper of the National Register to exclude non-contributing properties that occur at the edge of districts from the designated area and to redefine historic boundaries accordingly. He suggested that an appropriate approach in this case is to draw a line around the individual properties that are contributing.

Gasser noted the presence of the 1987 Pueblo Grande subdivision re-plat (MCR 299-05) at the western boundary of Park Tract. He suggested this could also be considered modern construction. He noted the occurrence of modern residential duplex at 209 W 10th Street, the bike shop at 1004 South Mill, the Jewish Student Center at 1012 South Mill, the Lutheran Church at 1034 S Mill, and the bagel shop at 1038 South Mill. He noted that the 1925 church is individually eligible for listing on the National Register. Gasser indicated everything south of this point on Mill dates from the Park Tract period of significance.ⁱⁱ

Wilson suggested more research should be done to determine the contributing status of individual properties and recommended drawing boundaries to include all properties with adequate integrity that date to the period of significance of the proposed district.

Gasser noted the question of the Williams parcels located at 63 and 69 West 13th Street having been omitted from the historic 1945 plat for the College View subdivision. Wilson noted that this was never part of the College View or any other subdivision plat, however, with construction dating to 1946, these properties fall within the period of significance for College View and have historically been part of the neighborhood. Gasser noted the question of the properties at the corner of 13th Street and Mill Avenue, noting that many of the church-owned parcels are vacant lots.

Karyn Gitlis stated the neighborhood is very definitely defined by strong and apparent boundaries. She said within those borders, the distinction between subdivisions is neither recognizable, nor recognized, as this is in reality one continuous neighborhood. Gitlis said the edges of the narrow neighborhood have historically functioned as a buffer to the residential core of the neighborhood. Gitlis indicated the neighborhood rationale behind bringing two nominations was to improve the odds of getting something accomplished.

Betsy Tait stated her family has lived in College View for many years and that over time she has seen many forces adversely impact the historic integrity of this area. Tait urged members to consider the significance of the resources remaining here from the 1920s and 30s, and to recognize that although this subdivision was not platted until 1945, a neighborhood already existed here much earlier.

Commissioner Esquer asked Mike Deskin about the interior 2005 Hazelton Property subdivision re-plat (MCR 664-05) in the 1200 block of Maple. Deskin stated this consists of one vacant parcel and one historic residence relocated from parcel adjacent to the south. Wilson noted that vacant lots are likely candidates for new infill construction and that HPC review will not apply if these areas are excluded. Gasser indicated he would be opposed to excluding internal parcels from district boundaries.

Bob Gray stated he owns and lives in the historic 1939 Butler [Gray] House located at 1220 S. Mill Avenue, which is listed as property number 22 in the Tempe Historic Property Register. He indicated his support for including vacant parcels as well as neighborhood edges wherever possible in consideration of both the narrowness of the district overall and of the substantial effect changes to these properties will have on the character and quality of the neighborhood. He urged the commission to consider the Lutheran Church at 1034 S Mill and the historic 1925 Minson House ancillary to the church to be part of the neighborhood.

It was decided to schedule the ZDC 6-402 Neighborhood Meeting for Maple Ash subdivisions designation separate from the regular August HPC meeting.

CONSENSUS – COMPLETE NOMINATION, ADVERTISE AND HOLD ZONING & DEVELOPMENT CODE SECTION 6-402 NEIGHBORHOOD MEETING WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 16, 2006.

IV. Discuss & Consider – Changes to the Tempe Historic Preservation Ordinance

Chairman Gasser introduced discussion to review ordinance changes asking that this review proceed sequentially from beginning to end and emphasizing that the proposed changes included in the packet are recommendations from individual members. Gasser said he does not want to move these changes forward without consensus.

1) Sec. 14A-2 Definitions. Distinctive Character.

Add the words and landscaping as follows; *Distinctive character* means the distinguishing architectural, ~~and~~ aesthetic AND LANDSCAPING characteristics of a landmark or historic property, or those generally found throughout an historic district, which fulfill the criteria for designation (Patterson 06/06/06). There was consensus to make this change.

2) Section 14A-3 (b) (1) Commission membership

All members shall be Tempe residents **or property owners** with a demonstrated interest in or knowledge of historic preservation (Gasser 06/04/06). There was consensus to make this change.

3) Section 14A-3 (k) (2) Commission duties and activities

Reviewing or making decisions on applications for proposed alterations, new construction, demolition or removal affecting landmarks, historic properties or properties located within a historic district, **or within 300 feet of a designated district, landmark or historic property**; such review shall be based on the criteria as specified in 14A-6 of this chapter (Gasser 06/04/06). City Architect Vinson asked if the intent here is to have the same regulatory authority to approve or deny applications within the 300 foot area as the commission has for designated properties or is the intent to act in an advisory capacity in the case of proxemic projects. Gasser indicated the intent is to assume an advisory role. Vinson suggested the language should more clearly reflect this intent.

Section 14A-3 (k) (2) (a) Commission duties and activities (**restated and renumbered**):

a) ~~Reviewing or making decisions~~ **and making recommendations to the planning and zoning commission**, on applications for proposed alterations, new construction, demolition or removal affecting landmarks, historic properties or properties located within a historic district, or within 300 feet of a designated district, landmark or historic property; such review shall be based on the criteria as specified in 14A-6 of this chapter (Consensus 07/13/06). There was concern about determining an appropriate distance triggering commission review. There was consensus to continue this discussion.

4) Section 14A-4 (a) (2) Designation of landmarks, historic properties and historic districts

(2) It is found to be of exceptional significance and expresses a distinctive character, resulting from:

a. A significant portion of it is at least fifty (50) years old; is reflective of the city's cultural, social, political or economic past; and is associated with a person or event significant in local, state or national history; or

b. It represents an established and familiar visual feature of an area of the city, due to a prominent location or singular physical feature; (Gasser 06/04/06).

It was proposed to delete Section 14A-4 (a) (2) in its entirety. There was concern about eliminating ability to designated properties to the Tempe Historic Property Register not eligible for listing on the State or National Register. It was suggested that eliminating the word "exceptional" from 14A-4 (a) (2) would provide the desired clarity.

14A-4 (a) (2) Designation of landmarks, historic properties and historic districts (**restated**):

(2) It is found to be of **exceptional** significance and expresses a distinctive character, resulting from: a... b... There was consensus to make this change.

Garrison stated notwithstanding the intentions of the Arizona Historic Sites Review Committee to nominate properties to both registers simultaneously, some properties listed in the State Register have been declined by the Keeper. Although the designation criteria are the same for both registers, approximately 10 additional properties are listed in the Arizona Historic Property Register and are not in the National Register of Historic Places. He indicated the SHPO is not opposed to a more encompassing local registry as protections may be provided locally that are not available otherwise.

CONSENSUS – CONTINUE SEQUENTIAL ORDINANCE REVIEW AUGUST 10, 2006

V. Discuss & Consider – Designation Eligibility Criteria & Process

Chairman Gasser introduced discussion to review designation eligibility criteria and processes for evaluating significance of candidate districts and property integrity referring to the rubric for quantifying the test for integrity prepared by Commissioner Patterson and distributed at this meeting. He requested that this be included in the next agenda packet so that members can have an opportunity to review and comment on this information.

CONSENSUS – CONTINUE DEVELOPMENT OF PATTERSON INTEGRITY EVALUATION RUBRIC AUGUST 10, 2006

VI. Discuss & Consider – Annual Statewide SHPO CLG Conference

Chairman Gasser introduced discussion to review the 2006 conference experience and determine interest in funding member attendance next year in Prescott June 15~17, 2007. A pole of members indicated interest in attending.

CONSENSUS – PURSUE FUNDING TO SEND DELEGATION OF MEMBERS AND QUALIFIED INDIVIDUALS TO ATTEND 2007 CONFERENCE

VII. Discuss & Consider – Valley National Bank ASU Visitor Center

Chairman Gasser introduced discussion to consider action alternatives to avoid ASU demolition of landmark structure at 826 E. Apache Blvd. noting an article in today's Arizona Republic. He recalled that HPC attended each of the ASU master planning meetings held last year and at each meeting members expressed concern about proposed demolition of this landmark property. Gasser suggested that other efforts have been made to protect this important community cultural resource noting a website operated by a Scottsdale Architect and ongoing initiatives by the Arizona Preservation Foundation. It was suggested that given the apparent uncertainty about the future of this property, an injunction could be sought from the State Attorney General's Office to stay demolition until ASU has complied with the State Historic Preservation Act.

Jim Garrison though filing an injunction to make ASU complete the State Historic Preservation Act consultations might be the only effective option, and that he indicated any citizen or

group could request an injunction from the Attorney General's office.ⁱⁱⁱ

CONSENSUS – PURSUE OBTAINING ATTORNEY GENERAL OFFICE INJUNCTION TO COMPLY WITH STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS THROUGH THE TEMPE AND/OR ARIZONA PRESERVATION FOUNDATIONS

VII. Discuss & Consider – Future Agenda Items

SHPO Garrison stated his office is in the process of updating the Arizona Historic Preservation Plan. He handed HPO a copy of the survey SHPO is preparing as part of the update process. He requested members advise on the completeness of the questionnaire noting he is not asking members to fill it out at this time, but to mark it up for any omissions or changes prior to distribution by SHPO.

The following items were requested to be included on the August agenda:

- 1) Revisions to the Tempe Historic Preservation Ordinance (consent).
- 2) Review of designation eligibility criteria & process (Gasser).
- 3) Discuss and consider action alternatives to avoid demolition of the historic Vienna bakery building at 415 South Mill Avenue (Siefer).
- 4) Discuss and consider opportunities to assist developer selected for Hayden Flour Mill and Silos and complete designation (Gasser).
- 5) Discuss and consider formal HPC support for a memorial to late Dr. Alfred E. Dittert at trail head to Loma del Rio archaeological site (Douglass).
- 6) SHPO Arizona Historic Preservation Plan Update comments on questionnaire (Garrison).

The meeting adjourned at 8:25 PM.

Minutes scheduled for Tempe HPC approval on 08/10/2006.

Bob Gasser, Chair



Rdevpub/HistoricPreservation/HPCmins071306PROCEEDINGS.doc

Meeting minutes are produced from a transcript of proceedings. The transcript of proceedings and the minutes are available on request from Tempe HPO.

HPCmins071306.doc filed City Clerk 08/14/06 Krosschell, Connie; Fillmore, Karen; Stennerson, Julie & posted to www.tempe.gov/historicpres

Draft issued for review comments to:	Review comments received from:
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Jim Garrison SHPO	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Karyn Gitlis 85281	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Virginia Sandstedt 85281	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Betsy Tait 85281	<input type="checkbox"/>

ⁱ Bob Gasser - Fri 07/21/2006 4:01 PM - 4th paragraph under III please add "relatively new" in front of "non-contributing properties?" The intent of my colored version was only to show the "new" stuff. I did not even try to get into contributors vs. non-contributors within the residential area.

ⁱⁱ Bob Gasser - Fri 07/21/2006 4:01 PM - III last paragraph on p. 2. Did we say that 1960 was the end date on the period of significance? Thought it was maybe 1950. As you know, a lot of people don't relate to the 1960's as historic. We might need to discuss this further.

ⁱⁱⁱ Bob Gasser - Fri 07/21/2006 4:01 PM - Under VII summarizing what Jim Garrison said. Essentially, that he though filing an injunction to make ASU complete the State Historic Preservation Act consultations might be the only effective option, and that he indicated any citizen or group could request an injunction from the Attorney General's office. That is my recollection, and it sets up why we reached the consensus.

Frequently Used Abbreviations or Acronyms:

CDD – City of Tempe Community Development Department: Established February 15, 2005, by City Manager Will Manley the CDD consists of six divisions; Economic Development, Housing Services, Redevelopment, Neighborhood Enhancement, Rio Salado/Town Lake, and Special Projects. The Tempe Historic Preservation Office is an agency of the Development Services Department.

CLG – Certified Local Government: In 1980, Congress established a framework for local preservation programs through an amendment to the National Historic Preservation Act empowering Arizona cities and counties to become Certified Local Governments (CLGs). Once certified, these entities are eligible for specialized assistance and funds for developing their own local preservation programs. The City of Tempe became a CLG in 1995.

HPAC – Historic Preservation Advisory Committee: Arizona State Parks is governed by the State Parks Board and receives direction and oversight from several advisory committees and groups such as the Historic Preservation Advisory Committee, also known as HPAC.

IEBC – International Existing Building Code adopted by Tempe City Council by Ordinance No. 2005.89 on December 1, 2005, as part of the code body promulgated by the International Code Council, provides means for preservation of existing Tempe building inventory through reasonable and feasible code processes.

IRS – Issue Review Session: Mayor and Council public meeting where members of the public may come forward and talk with City Council during the “Call to the Audience” at the beginning of the IRS.

SHPO – State Historic Preservation Office: a division of Arizona State Parks, is responsible for the identification, evaluation, and protection of Arizona's prehistoric and historic cultural resources.

SRP-MIC – Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community: Created by Executive Order on June 14, 1879 by President Rutherford B. Hayes, the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community (SRPMIC) is located in Maricopa County, aside the boundaries of Mesa, Tempe, Scottsdale, Fountain Hills and metropolitan Phoenix.

Tempe HPC – Tempe Historic Preservation Commission: Created by Ordinance 95.35, adopted November 9, 1995. Members serve three year terms with the exception of the initial appointments. Meetings are held first Thursday of each month and are located at Hatton Hall, 34 E. 7th Street, Bldg. #B (public parking in Brickyard).

Tempe HPF – Tempe Historic Preservation Foundation: A private nonprofit corporation established in 2005, Mission Statement 02.02.06 “The Tempe HPF advocates preserving Tempe’s at risk historic properties and supporting worthy preservation projects through education, community participation, and fundraising.”

Tempe HPO – Tempe Historic Preservation Office: Responsible for the identification and conservation of Tempe’s prehistoric and historic cultural resources, the Office uses Federal, state, and city funding for the historic preservation program and assists owners of historic properties with grant applications, property maintenance, and preservation activities.

THM – Tempe Historical Museum: Located at 809 E. Southern Avenue in Tempe, the Tempe Historical Museum is a center where the community comes together to celebrate Tempe's past and ponder the future. Permanent and changing exhibits, educational programs, and research projects generally focus on some aspect of Tempe's history within the context of state and national events.

TOD – Tempe Transportation Overlay District (in production) The purpose of the TOD is to encourage appropriate land development and redevelopment consistent with and complementary to the community’s focused investment in transit, bicycle, and pedestrian infrastructure in certain geographic areas of the City.

ZDC – Zoning & Development Code: Adopted by Mayor and Council on January 20, 2005, effective February 22, 2005, the ZDC implements Tempe General Plan 2030 by encouraging creative development of the built environment in order to build a community that promotes the livability and uniqueness of Tempe.